

• YOUNG INDIA

Vol. III

JULY 1929

No. 7

University of Texas

AUG 5 1930

LIBRARY

British Whitewash of Jallianwalla Massacre

A Nationalist Manifesto

Repression and Revolution

Published monthly by the India Home Rule League of America
1009 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 15 cents a copy. \$1.50 a year.

Entered as second-class matter September 16, 1919, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Art Section

Rama, Sita and Lakshmana

By ANANDA COMMERCESWAMY

The Rajput Polara painting reproduced this month, from the original in the collection of Mr. Arthur H. Dunsen, illustrates the 'Forest episode' incident of the Ramayana. It will be recalled that as the result of the abducting of Sita by the mother-in-law of Rama, Rama, the hero-epicure, was exiled three Ayodhya his fourteen years and that he was accompanied in exile by his devoted wife Sita and his brother Lakshmana. The forest-episode is that of a modern 'summer camp,' but touched with all the measured stern of the Indian hermitage abridged by holy men and an intense sympathy with the life of animals and trees, expressed in many lyrical and tender passages—passed ultimately the occasion for the rape of Sita by the demon king of Lanka, Rama, from whom she was recovered after the siege of Lanka, in which Rama was aided by armies of bees and monkeys, and particularly by the monkey chieftain Hanuman, who was subsequently deified. But in our picture we have represented the purely idyllic aspect of the forest life, before the events referred to, and with an suggestion of the dangers Lakshmana has been hunting, and bringing home a deer to offer as respectfully to his elder

brother; Sita stands shyly behind Rama, resting one hand on the branch of a tree, from the branches of which hang the clustering sprays of a creeper. The color scheme is largely in cool greens and greys and is a natural analogue to that of the Krishna painting reproduced in our April number. There is a peculiar sweetness in the delineation and the gestures of the human figures, while the foliage of the trees outlined against the dark forest background is treated in a manner almost impressionistic and characteristically modern.

YOUNG INDIA 1406 BROADWAY NEW YORK

EDITORIAL STAFF

J. T. Sankarbad	Editor
R. S. Bhattacharya	Managing Editor
R. K. Khanna	Assistant Editor
M. M. Mitter	
D. S. Vajpeyee	General Manager
Ananda Commerswamy	Special Art Contributor

ADVISORY BOARD

J. T. Sankarbad	Chairman
M. K. Bhattacharya	
R. S. Bhattacharya	
Prasad Bhattacharya	
Prasad Bhattacharya	
Singh Tolera	Secretary

The Editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions expressed in articles contributed to Young India.

Please make checks payable to Young India.

YOUNG INDIA, Feb., 1937



RAMAYANA: RAMA, SITA AND LAKSHMANA
IN THE FOREST

Rajput painting, Bhadoosa, 17th century
Collection of Arthur H. Dunsen

YOUNG INDIA

Vol. III

JULY 1920

No. 7

Editorial Notes

Educated Indians

The average Englishman, the Imperialist, the typical Imperialist, is content to hang on when staring at the "educated Indians" whom he delights to regard as less or number, unimportant as influence, pretended friends, but real by reason of the Indian cause—"a much needed support, indispensable too, made up of smart college and plebeian. And he is a A's, well educated writers and clerks, ambitious journalists, some hard-throwers, hard theory on and the like. (Then, quoted words are taken from an article by a distinguished Englishman in a great New York daily.)

Mr. Macmillan could hardly be greater, more unbounded, at most one class in their efforts. Of course, it is not to say at anything—it is not in a common mind. But in no land is the educated class less deserving of respect, or more worthy of respect than in India.

It is true the educated Indians are few compared with the whole vast population of the country. But they are not actually few. They number many scores of thousands. Considering how little the government has done to promote education, and the poverty of the

country, it is something that their rank has so great.

And who are they? They are graduates of five large universities and of more than a hundred colleges of India, many of them also graduates of Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Glasgow, London or universities in the continent of Europe, or Japan, or in America. As a rule, they are earnest, high minded, able men, who when studying in foreign countries have shown themselves quite the peers of the other young men. The truth is the educated leaders of India are the equals of the educated leaders of Japan, and China, and they do not fall below, either in character or ability, the educated leaders of England and America.

How India is Educated

A report from Munim, a director in Bombay, reveals the absolute indifference of the British Indian rulers to that all important function of any government—education. The deplorable state of education in India is not new to our readers. One of the features of the review in Munim will be of interest, however.

The salary of teachers in the district is 100-150 rupees a month. Upon this

142

YOUNG INDIA

primarily concern the teachers are reported to be—high food and clothing, books, and other necessities. The report states that the number of teachers is rapidly decreasing. With such indications, what wonder?

There is no provision made in the budget of the district administrations for the purchase of school books, maps, or other necessary adjuncts to instruction. No changes in methods of teaching have been introduced for years, new systems are entirely unknown.

With these conditions obtaining, the British Government still professes a desire to fit Indians for self-government!

Government and Logic

The argument against self-government for India, offered by the British government, should elicit the admiration of the world. It is so simple, so logical, so wholly conclusive. It is this:

If India manifests discontent with present conditions and agitates for reforms that shows that she is a sensible, logical, vigorous people, her own interests and it therefore are in her self-government.

On the other hand, if she does not agitate for reforms but remains quiet, that means that she is content with things as they are and therefore of course does not want self-government.

That is either case, it would be illogical and illogical to assume a fairly strong to give her any kind of government to expect that which the British people, who are so much wiser than the people of

India, have already provided for her.

And so, as Mr. Dingley says, "There we are."

"Britons Never Will Be Slaves"

Englishmen may possibly, "Britons Never Will Be Slaves." That is all well and good, but have those making others slaves? How about building India against her will, by the power of the sword, as a "White empire"?

Said Abraham Lincoln: "There is a weight of oppression, and he who would be no slave must have no slave. Those who deny freedom to others, deserve it not for themselves and under a just God, cannot long retain it."

And James Russell Lowell writes:

"Mind! Whose heart it is that ye
Came of fathers brave and free,
If there be on earth a slave
Are ye truly free and brave?
If ye do not feel the chain,
When a wretch writhes in pain,
Are ye not here slaves indeed,
Slaves necessarily to be freed?"

Is true Freedom but to break
Freedom for our own dear sake,
And, with brotherly hearts, forget
That we owe mankind a debt?
Not true Freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And with heart and hand, to be
Empire to make others free."

India and Russia

At the present time the one question confronting the British Empire is how to fortify itself against the influence of

Russia, which is spreading throughout the East. Consequently it is that a prominent problem of how Great Britain is to maintain the stronghold she has in India, against these Bolshevik advances. No more clear, powerful, and logical analysis of the Imperial situation has been presented than the one by Mr. E. D. Morel, the foremost English politician and writer on world diplomacy. In an article in the *New York Call* of recent date he shows how British statesmen are struggling with this issue in the Russian situation. The maneuvers in trade and political policies made by Great Britain are explained, and the actual preparations for facing the danger as formulated by British statesmen, are outlined in the article. Mr. Morel then says:

"The heart of the British Empire beats in Asia. Logical not of the Commonwealth, but of the Empire, British Imperialism has become a military; Imperialism is never alone, in order that the Empire in Asia be preserved from foreign encroachment. To (Great Britain) has swung around to the old Roman conception of Empire." The debates in the House of Commons and of Lords and the speeches of generals and diplomats in social assemblies are sought testimony to the latter situation. Mr. Morel quotes from the speech of Sir Henry Wilson who recently declared: "Except in August of 1914, our country, our empire has never wanted you (the soldiers and sailors) more. — Our command on sea, on land, in the air, is being challenged on various parts of the world." ("Another speech is quoted, this having been uttered by a member of the House of Lords. "Two

thirds of the work of the war staff at the navy is or ought to be done in the peace time." Still another expression is given as follows: "Our armed preparations must continue in spite of League of Nations, of treaties in any thing else." Lord Curzon's statements are not less emphatic regarding the law war and a clearly substance of Britain's policies at the present time. "The usual degree to which we were prepared for all developments that would arise in the course of that war of the most able and scientific of our days."

Thus deliberately, secretly, British Imperialism are preparing for conflicts created by their own policies. As Mr. Morel remarks in his analysis, "In the League of Nations and the Russian Revolution there are the greatest interests which British Imperialism fears. Both of these factors will really affect the Asiatic peoples in the overthrow of the Imperial stronghold in the East."

The Turkish Problem

Several important developments in the Middle Eastern are to be noted as a study of the forebodings of the terms of the Turkish treaty by the League of Nations Council of the League of Nations.

From recent newspapers received from India it seems that all sections of the people there have passed in denunciations of the treaty in its present form. The necessity of feeling on the question is so great that serious consequences were feared. To prevent any mishap, Mr. M. K. Gandhi has issued a plea and warning to the people. Among other things, he says:

"The decision is bound to demoralise Mohammedans and I hope that Mohammedan leaders will neither be disappointed nor give way to anger. Non-cooperation is the only remedy enabling India to give disciplined expression to the deep wound made into her heart."

Although the Islamic community, following the advice of Mr. Gandhi, has thus far committed no breach of peace, when it being planned in the event that the Turkish Treaty is forced upon the Moslems would. One of the main aims contemplated has to do with the recognition to be accorded to the Prince of Wales as his proposed visit to India. The Moslems have declared that "in consideration of the attitude of the Prince Consort and the British Government against Islam, it would be impossible to welcome His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, with any demonstrations."

This is not all. A proclamation has been sent by the Moslem community to Lord Curzon, the Viceroy of India, declaring: "The Islamic Government makes it impossible for the faithful any longer to remain under British rule peacefully. We have therefore decided unequivocally to quit this country in peace." It is difficult to say how fully this declaration will be carried out. It does, however, portray the depth of feeling with regard to the issue.

Somewhat with this attitude a telegram was sent to a member of the Afghan mission, in which telegram the late Moslems expressed their thankfulness to the Amir for his hospitality in allowing to remain Indian Moslems.

Both of these acts indicate that Indian Moslems will not remain silent in the face of any further developments which may be unfavorable to them. Sufficient feeling has already been expressed in different written demonstrations, if the day is not distant when

Mr. Sir Mohd. Singh, the well known Indian publicist, has recently analysed the situation in an article in the *London Graphic*. Speaking on the significance of the Turkish issue to India, as well as to the rest of the world, he says:

"People in India and other lands with a large Moslem population regard the question as a national issue, on the principle that any interference to the Moslems is an interference to their fellow-countrymen. As the largest Moslem power in the world, and particularly in the eastland in India, where Hindu-Moslem unity has produced a national solidarity unknown of even a few years ago Britain has a responsibility for the determination of Turkey's fate greater than that of any other nation."

Decisions upon the Ottoman settlement will depend, as an small degree the human policy of the world, and, therefore, our decision cannot at times be a decision that will command itself to posterity."

To Our Readers

The editors of *Young India* wish to offer an apology, to our readers for the confusing typographical errors which appeared in the article on the "Punjab Disturbances" in the last number.

We sincerely hope that such errors will not occur again.

Punjab Report---More Facts

In our last issue a summary was given of the Report of the Commissioners appointed by the Indian National Congress to investigate the disturbances in the Punjab during the early part of 1919. Several points, which were omitted by us because of lack of space are important for an understanding of the causes of the uprisings, the psychology of the official mind, and the disastrous effects on the people of the Martial Law regime which continued for ten months after the disturbances had ceased.

The most outstanding fact in the first portion of the summary, which deals with the causes which led up to the outbreak of April 1919 (the burning of buildings, cutting of telegraph wires, and killing of several Englishmen) is that the action of the mob was directly caused by the policy of the Government. Particularly was this true in the Punjab, where the Governor, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, had suggested the whole province by his cruel, unscrupulous, and reckless suppression of the rights of the people, and his conduct based upon the educated classes.

The regime of O'Dwyer is characterized as follows by the Commissioners in the Report:

"He (Sir Michael O'Dwyer) was one of hundreds of local men with rank, or no rank. He gazed the vernacular press, perceiving the Nationalist papers circulating outside of the Punjab from circulating in the Province. He perceived the circulation of even the persecuted vernacular papers, and brought

about a state of things whereby it became practically impossible for the people of the province to have a free interchange of independent views . . . and having prevented free speech and free writing, he allowed himself to think, and give narratives in unbroken that the people of the Punjab were the biggest fools in the world."

Throughout the war period, the British states, he had made himself conspicuous, and based by his methods of collecting funds and recruiting men for the army. One device, according to the Report, was "to burn" (indiscriminately) to furnish recruits on the grounds of suffering their rights (to hold land).

In concluding the chapter on the administration of O'Dwyer, the Report remarks: "We feel obliged to say that he received evidence from the people in that he could reach them. The evidence in the appendix shows that he subjected the Punjabites in the government process runs under which they immediately lost self-control." This was the real explanation of such acts as occurred.

Regarding the Agrarian question whose memory is vividly engraved on the minds of the Indian people, the Report presents proof that the meeting at the Jullianwala Park was the result of a pre-arranged plan by the Government to create a "ragging blow" at the people. The evidence of a government agent, Hans Raj, shows clearly that he had been instructed by the administration at Amritsar to deliberately gather together the people on the day, that in order to effect this he had used the name

of Lala Kanhay Lal, a "respected scholar,"—on account a large gathering—and that on the 15th of April, the day of the massacre, he held the people together and dissuaded them from displaying rifles they saw the military approaching. The Report says:

"On April 15th Hans Raj announced that a meeting would be held on April 17th under the chairmanship of Lala Kanhay Lal," who deemed "ever having been asked to preside at any such meeting." Hans Raj (on the day of the meeting) presided over the gathering's arrival, was in possession of the audience estimated at 50000. An aeroplane was hovering over the meeting, before the arrival of the troops. Hans Raj asked the meeting how to be saved. There were nine C. I. G. (secretaries) present at the meeting. Two of them were seen talking to Hans Raj."

This is sufficient to indicate that the government had calculated the whole massacre, and had employed great precautions to further its plan.

The horrible details of the Amritsar butchery are already well known and need no repetition. The proclamation of martial law was but a further justification of the desert on the part of the military in fully revenge themselves on the people. To that end, provisions were made:

1. For all persons passing through the street in which Main Street (in Englishman) was situated, to stand on their bellies.
2. For all Indians in uniform (soldiers) carry Englishman, "on pain of being arrested and suffering indignities."
3. For all Indians "to be made ap-

pear in uniform and wear the military uniform."

4. For flogging, to be administered publicly.

There are but a very few of the numerous orders which were issued to humiliate the Indian people. The Report relates numerous instances of "honor punishment" issued not to make the people feel the strength of government. Concerning flogging, it says:

"Flogging was administered on the cordoned benches at first discipline and in those suspected of insulting Mrs. Sherwood. Then, as boys were dressed in triangles, and each given 30 stripes. One of them, Bhandar Singh, became restless after the fourth stripe, but when some water was poured into his mouth by a soldier, required consciousness. Flogging was then resumed. His last consciousness for the second time, but the flogging never ceased till he was given 30 stripes. He was taken off the flogging post bleeding and quite unconscious. The other boys were similarly treated. They were all handcuffed and, as they could not walk, they were dragged by the police."

Here is another case:

"Lala Datta Mal was beaten and made to crawl. He and his son were arrested and he was discharged and re-arrested and at last let off after he had paid one hundred rupees. Colonel E. J. O. to the headman, for the police. He was returned and compelled to pay fifty rupees more and purchase his release. His son was detained for eight days and was then given 30 stripes, although during the process he became unconscious."

- He was where they being flogged. He says: "these men showed great pain and were all bleeding."

In Lahore a martial law notice had been passed on to the walls of a college. The notice ran, in the course of time, down the street. To punish the "erring dacoit," Colonel Johnson, who directed the distribution of penalties at Lahore, ordered the arrest of all males on the premises, including the professors. The 300 students that arrested were marched in the hot summer sun to a hot three miles away and kept in the fort for two days. Colonel Johnson, in giving his evidence, declared that he did this to show the might of the martial law, that he considered it a proper exercise of his authority, and added, "I will do it again tomorrow if the necessaries require."

- At Kanpur "40 men were sentenced to be whipped. The total number of stripes given was 720. The flogging post was erected at the station platform. School boys were also punished with flogging. The headmaster of one school is supposed to have reported that his boys were getting disobedient and asked for military help. Therefore two from the school were ordered to be collected." The headmaster selected six boys, who were however, not fit physically. The government, considering it over, therefore rejected them and selected six others who were "badly fitted to receive the punishment." In answer to the question by the investigating committee as to the object, the Kanpur military men declared "there was no particular object."

- At another place a Mr. Bannard Smith took a gun himself to teach the people a lesson. He gathered together

in the case the people of the place. And addressing them, declared that they were all "worse and contemptible than black men, contemptible people, all of one color, inasmuch as they had all rebelled against the government by showing their shyness." Here we have eloquence of language unsurpassed!

Near Coopersville, in a village, a boy had "unwittingly" crossed the soldiers' cordons and was grazing his goats. He was shot and died on the spot. Two or three British soldiers took the dead body with his turban, dragged it and left it by the post near the village."

Many of the punishments are too horrible, too disgusting and too cruel to relate.

In addition to the conditions stated above, the investigating Committee arrived at others of importance among which are the following:

1. There was firing and disorder of a serious nature in Amritsar and several other places in which five Englishmen were killed and one Englishwoman was badly injured and so which also there was considerable destruction of property. Thus the Commission condemns, and holds that the Government was right in using force to restore order.
2. But the killing and these excesses did not provide, but followed and were caused by the cruel, contemptuous and outrageous conduct of the military authorities in firing upon peaceful and unarmed companies of people and then killing and wounding many rebellious innocent persons.

3. The people of the whole Punjab had long been incensed against Governor O'Dwyer for the reasons which have of ready been pointed out.

4. The Bomber Bill had shocked and shocked all India, but especially the Punjab, by their severity and injustice.

Thus the public mind had been brought up to a state of irritation and excitement, by causes for which the British government was alone responsible. With public feeling in such an inflamed condition, it was not strange that the sight of their powerful relatives and neighbours shot down by their side by order of the Government, such, as they believed, no punishment, should create in the people a feeling of anger, resentment and revenge, expressing itself in such violence.

3. So far as the facts are publicly known, there was no reasonable cause shown to justify the introduction of martial law. In such case martial law was proclaimed also order had been completely restored.

6. Most of the measures taken under martial law in all the five districts were unnecessary, cruel, oppressive, and in some damaged at the feelings of the people affected by them.

2. The existing order and other fancy punishments were necessary of a criminal administration and were symptomatic of the moral degeneration of their leaders.

5. The Jallianwala Bagh massacre was a criminal piece of barbarism towards utterly innocent and unarmed men, women and children, and unparalleled for its brutality in the history of modern British administration.

The above is a very brief and inadequate summary of the facts brought to light, and the conclusions reached by the Investigating Commission of the Indian National Congress. But space does not allow us to make it more full.

In our opinion, the Report of the Commission is a masterpiece of common sense of British officialdom's recognition of Indian rights and Indian freedom as of basic importance, and of Indian life as very cheap. In it, such methods of government as those seen in the Punjab that the British Empire is going to be changed (General Dyer) into a commonwealth of Free Nations?

Hunter Report--an Official Whitewash

Since the publication, in *Young India* at Jinnah, of the summary of the report prepared by the Committee of the Indian National Congress on the Punjab disturbances in 1919, there has been published the report of the Hunter Commission, the official body appointed by the government of India to investigate the events of last year. A summary of this report, printed in the London *Daily Herald* recently, is reproduced below. Since the full report has not yet reached

of us we withhold comment on it.

The *Daily Herald's* story, in part, is as follows:

There are two Reports, one by the six British members of the Committee—Lord Hunter, Major-General Baines, Mr. Justice Rowlatt, Mr. Kerr, and Mr. Smith, the other by the three Indian members—Sir Chittaranjan Das, Sir Sivas Aiyar, and Mr. Justice Rowlatt.

It should be noted at the outset that the Reports are based entirely on the evidence of officials. This creates suspicion. Why was the testimony of non-officials that not? Is it possible for officials to be wholly fair and unbiased in trying cases of their own class?

The majority report is an amazing confession of excuse and is whitewash all the British officials concerned.

On the whole issue of whether the application of martial law was necessary or all, emergency and necessity designed carefully.

The majority appears to be. The minority holds that it was entirely unnecessary, and that order could have been restored without it.

The real spot on the whole report is, of course, its treatment of the slaughter of Jallianwala Bagh.

The majority's comments are amazing. They give the facts—the shooting from a machine, shot by General Dyer himself, that surrounded and harried the whole world. And they seem to regard them as pretty much a matter of course—in the natural order of things under the circumstances.

They admit that there was no question of "saving the situation" and "restoring a rebellion"—as General Dyer's most enthusiastic supporters have suggested when arguing that he deserves no punishment but reward. They admit that there was no emergency to justify firing "without warning." But they hardly add that firing would probably have been necessary in any case to secure obedience to the proclamation.

They only condemn as the General is that in continuing to fire for so long

he committed a grave error, and that this was unfortunately a mistaken conception of the duty.

The minority, besides characterising General Dyer's conduct as criminal and un-British, and his defence as the plea that has always been advanced in justification of the Ferozian massacre, brings out the fact that the Punjab Government had no trouble whatever in finding out what had happened and for two months did not even weary to investigate the massacre.

The findings of the majority on the Amritsar massacre are typical of their whole report. Confronted they cannot, anywhere they palliate. Their conclusion is of the lightest.

At Amritsar, where 25 were killed and 125 wounded (there were probably more, but the others have not been traced) the "behaviour of the natives was exemplary."

The firing at Lahore is justified on evidence which the minority hold to be rather false or exaggerated. A crowd of 5,000, and Colonel Nisai, was trying to pull down the buildings round the fort. The minority points out that if this really were so, it is very odd that no damage of any kind was done to these buildings.

Thus the Commission passes to the issue in the Punjab villages.

The Minority Report tells how an armed force pulled up near the village of Chhabra and fired on men who were usually into the village, though no acts of violence were being committed there.

It tells how a train pulled up at Mithankot and fired into a "crowd" of 25 people just to "create an impression

was 'though the commander admitted he did not know what this "coup" was doing.

It tells how Captain Threlkeld said to the village of Chikabanka, to arrest one Ram Singh and spend five at a group of fugitives, apparently on the off-chance that Ram Singh was among them. He didn't get his man, but he killed five villagers.

Of these incidents all that the majority can say is that there is not sufficient ground for adverse criticism, and that the officers acted with promptitude and decorum.

The wrong worked by aeroplane bombs is well to be mechanized. And the remedy—pointing out that from an aeroplane it is quite impossible to judge whether people are peacefully engaged in riot and that anyway the risk of dropping quite innocent people is entirely unavoidable—"deprecate" (in old enough word) the use of aeroplanes for such purposes.

But the majority will have none of this. The use of bombs, they say, should be limited to cases of urgent need, and they decline to say a word against the mechanization of violence from the air. "However," they say, must reduce with these things!

So, confronted with the case of Major Corbrey who dropped bombs on the Khudai High School and on a couple of villages, they unanimously declare that they cannot "uphold" his action, but that at the same time they are "not prepared to impeach blame." And as to his mechanization of a fleeing crowd at Gajrawala, they remark that it does not appear successful!

As to the problems of the Army and

the Civil Service who armed themselves by despatching heavy punishments, the majority report does manage to suggest that they were justified. It doesn't quote like the idea of Indians, "whatever their wisdom is big," having to salute and salute and have and scrape to all officers. Class prejudice has got up against our population.

It very nearly manages to commend General Dyer's famous "ceasefire order"—in which he commanded all powers along the river where Main Sherwood was attacked to travel on hands and knees, suggesting that if the Indians didn't like it they could go over the roofs. And it does even succeed in saying right out that there were too many instances of flagging punishment, and that in future some restriction ought to be put on the power of officers to order flagging.

Throughout the whole of the Majority Report runs the assumption that all these things—driving on unarmed crowds, bombing of villages, flagging, and the rest of it—are thoroughly justifiable methods of maintaining the authority of the British Raj and of repressing undesirable popular movements. They may have been "effective" in some cases, "so justifiable" in others, but in principle they are quite right and proper.

The majority holds—the minority strongly dissenting—that the Punjab was in "open rebellion" against the British Raj, and that, therefore, though there was no use of firearms by the "rebels," no attempt to get firearms, no evidence of "intentional conspiracy," but only the ordinary manifestations of rebelliousness, the strongest measures of repression were justifiable.

That the Majority Report does not condemn the action of the government of India or of the government of the Punjab goes without saying. For four of the five majority men are soldiers or government officials.

Their attitude is well summed up in the pleasant phrase, "On a question as to the goodness of their was the wisdom of government must be decided."

With the report is issued also a copy of correspondence between the government of India and Mr. Montagu.

In this letter General Dyer and Sir Michael O'Dwyer, who appeared in action, came to his more severe criticism.

But the key remark of the government is:

It is no doubt a matter for regret that without resort to a formal inquiry full knowledge of what actually occurred should not have become general earlier. But the chapter is closed and the Government and the public both in India and the United Kingdom are now in complete possession of the facts, circumstances and reports which are useful for future.

Ah, yes! all this is very easy to say. But is the chapter closed? We suspect it is very far from closed. The future will tell.

Consistent with the publication of the Hunter Report comes a statement from Mr. Edwin Samuel Montagu, Secretary of State for India. This document is important in that it enunciates a principle of government, namely, the minimum use of force necessary; and at the same time it purifies the attitude of the Government of India, Lord Chelms-

ford, who, as responsible head of the state, made no attempt to arrest in rebellion General Dyer, General O'Dwyer or the other participants in their obviously excessive use of force at Amritsar. Mr. Montagu undertakes to use public force in Britain and abroad by ensuring General Dyer, but overlooks the fact that Lord Chelmsford, the supreme trustee of the British crown, can only ignore the demands of the people but respond on those an indemnity of more than a million dollars. In other words, Mr. Montagu wishes to place the weight by his vote, and at the same time condemn the action of the most responsible person in the entire affair.

From the lengthy comment which Mr. Montagu makes we take the following passages:

"The principle which has consistently governed the policy of His Majesty's government in dealing with riots is to be employed when military action in support of civil authority is required may be broadly stated as the use of minimum of force necessary. His Majesty's government is determined that this principle shall remain the primary basis of policy whenever circumstances substantially necessitate the suppression of civil disorder by military force within the British Empire."

"That Brigadier-General Dyer displayed humanity of purpose and unflinching adherence to his conception of duty cannot for a moment be questioned. His conception of duty in the circumstances in which he was placed was so fundamentally at variance with that which His Majesty's government has a right to expect from

officer who told His Majesty's commission, that it is impossible to regard him as fitted to remain entrusted with the responsibilities which his rank and position impose upon him."

Mr. Montagu appears to be the defender of martial law, and of the duty of its abrogation—that involves the sport

which "prompted the enforcement of punishments and orders calculated to cut off, to humiliate Indians as a race, to create unscrupulous incoherence amounting on occasion to injustice, and to float standards of propriety and humanity which the civilized world in general has a right to demand of those set at naught by them."

The American Press on The Amritsar Massacre

A dispatch from London to the *Hunter Report* has received much attention in the American Press, much of the comment being adverse to its condemnation of the majority report and of the situation in general. Says the *New York Globe*:

"The report is a colorful and interesting document when compared with what is admitted to have occurred. The emergency was doubtless great, but consider it in Berlin, London, or New York, and would such a slaughter appear so worse than 'open to criticism'?"

The *New York World* is no less severe in its remarks. Under the caption "Shambling in Amritsar" it says:

"The day for such bloody deeds as that which befell Amritsar has passed. Speaking of the 'crushing order' is dishonest. 'Such methods have not the world wondering if in such ways the British Government must maintain its much proved rule.'"

The *New York Evening Post*, while declaring that "more action was undoubtedly needed," repeatedly remarks

"It is a British boast that British law regards dark and white races as alike, and that when minorities are made they are protected. That martial case which would have done something to lessen the stain is lacking."

The *New York Herald* is no less of June 19th, devotes considerable space to the publication of a summary of the Congress Report and the Hunter Official Report. Commenting on the latter it says:

"The striking thing about the Hunter Report on Amritsar in India is not its cold-blooded detachment or its mild depreciation of measures. The tenor of the Hunter Report is an able assumption that British troops in India shall have the permanent right as maintain by force British rule and British 'order' even if every Indian must die in the process. On occasion the Report is effusive, boasting military from unbroken successes results in the death of innocent persons, and this is deplorable, but in general it is a method we feel called upon to approve. . . . Thus have argued tyrants

and their apologues on all ages. When the Court shut down powerful professions 'illegally assembled' before the House of Lords, in January 1904, the *London Herald* argued in the Hunter Commission against with regard to Amritsar. . . . The history of slavery and the history of autocratic military rule are not and the same. And the nation which thinks that way of history, be it Russian, or German, or British, or American, is doomed to the horror of war with its neighbors and the extinction at home."

A brief report of the Hunter document appeared also in the *Freeman*, New York. The article deals with the striking cases in the Hunter Report concerning the Amritsar massacre, and makes the following comment:

"The majority report justifies all other cases of violence on the part of the military and the police, but in the case of Amritsar it admonishes to General Dyer a sharp blow on the wrist.

It considers that his conduct was open to criticism for two reasons. First, he fired without warning; second, he fired too long. Considering the gentleman's admission, that many members of the gathering had probably never heard of his graduation, most critics would doubtless agree with the Commission on the first point. On the second, one is inclined to sympathize with the General. The Commission is not explicit enough. It should have determined the precise stand in which the troops of the massacre regarded the General in such things. According to his own testimony he fired three rounds. Should he have stopped just before the second or just after the second hundred and forty-sixth? The Commission raises a delicate question at this point, one which may be commended to the anxious consideration of all those who will be officially responsible for the formal and proper preparation of massacres hereafter."

Repression—Road to Revolution

By JOHN HENRI HARRIS and J. T. SCHEERMAN

In his message to Congress in December, 1914, President Wilson used the significant words, "Repression is the seed of revolution." There is a thought which it is of the greatest possible importance to keep in mind in times of political and social unrest like the present. Perhaps no social or political disorders of the past have been more serious than those which have sprung from ignorance or defiance of the principle which this thought reveals. To demonstrate the truth of this assertion, it is

only necessary to turn to the pages of history and read those the long continued wars, running through every age of human experience, of the repression that leads to revolution.

George III of England had the idea that repression was the right remedy for social and political unrest and the outcome in those chosen American colonies. But in the end, when it was too late, he discovered his fatal mistake: the policy of repression, so far from quelling the Americans, was the very

thing which brought about the results, and which not but longham the most precious jewel in its crown.

The same lesson has been taught in many times as in duty demonstration. The English, as though they had learned nothing from their American experience of 1776, have tried repression in Ireland for a hundred years, with the result that the Irish are more irreconcilable than ever before.

The Austrians tried repression in Italy with a severity hardly matched in modern times, with the dramatic results of Mazzini, Garibaldi, Cavour, and the establishment of the Kingdom of United Italy.

The Romans tried repression in Africa which for completeness of efficiency may be said to stand as a model for all future times, and for years the system seemed to justify itself by the success with which it suppressed and destroyed the revolutionary movements where another. But the significant thing is that while the revolutionary movements were destroyed, the revolutionary spirit remained untouched. Nay, it flourished, grew and deepened and spread in the atmosphere of repression and as a result of the force created by repression, until, in a sudden hour the hidden forces burst into eruption and swept away every vestige of the Government that did the repressing.

We think we have been a lesson for Great Britain in dealing with the unrest of India. Looked at from any possible standpoint India suffers more bitter wrongs, and more government, the last error of all of which is loss of freedom, deprivation of the right of self-determination.

When the British Government in India meets the inevitable sunset and agonises for reforms which these governments and wrongs create with influence of greater wrongs, with refusal to redress grievances, with cruel acts of repression, with tyrannical Bowdler Acts, with martial law, with imprisonment and deportation of innocent citizens without trial, with the shooting down of hundreds of unarmed men, women and children assembled for peace and for peaceful petition to the Government—when the Government of India does these things, is she not taking a course which, in any the least, is the most stupid and blind that she could possibly pursue? Instead of creating revolution, is she not driving India toward revolution, and violent revolution? Why does not England learn a lesson from her experience in connection with her American colonies and with Ireland, and then from the experience of France, Austria, Italy and Russia in connection with their efforts to curb popular unrest by repression?

The certainty of the failure of repression as a method of quelling agitation and the equal certainty of its success as a method of fostering revolution, become easily understandable if we turn from history to psychology, and analyse some of the factors involved.

What does a Government do, we ask with the Indians, but with the minds of people, when it becomes terrified for its own safety, and resorts to repression?

The first thing that a repressive Government accomplishes is to give people a cue against itself—to convince people that they are right in their desire to resist or destroy it. The

strange of action, and Robert Spence.

There are so much unfulfilled as mentioned. Miss out not so much when their minds are converted as when their emotions are stirred. This means that the security of any government depends not so much upon the judgment of the people as upon their feeling. It is in the awe and confidence of the people that the strength of a government lies. A government that pursues a policy of repression makes thousands of people who heretofore trusted in it and had been loyal to it, to hate it for its injustice and cruelty. Every citizen arrested and imprisoned, not for crime but for opinion, is turned from a potential lover into a potential hater of the government that thus treats him. And around each single person thus oppressed there are friends and kindred by the very who are taught to feel the same sentiments of indignation as himself in the mind of the one who suffers.

And this has another side, which is equally disastrous: the repression not only kills in the hearts of thousands all love for the government, but it develops in those same hearts a new and terrible love for the enemies of the government.

A third thing is accomplished by repression. We refer to the fact that repression gives the example into the people for the use of violence. Nothing in the world is more contagious than example, for the reason that man is essentially an imitative creature. When a government refuses to listen to the people, declines to give armed men but trials, declares that the remedy for political or industrial discontent is the policeman's club or the machine gun, teaches that the plant for its opinion is a volunteer in

a person will—it is simply appealing from reason and justice to force and violence. How can it wonder if its own methods of violence and force are mirrored by violence? Repression is simply the government's use by law, or without law, of violence. Its result is always to drive agitation out of the veins whithering out of the first out-of-there into the glowing channels of underground conspiracy. If the realisation of any country want to make sure of bombs and munitions and blood to avail for their pursuit the policy of meeting political, social and industrial unrest with repression and more repression. They will find this "high-handedness" creating other high-handedness in quarters where they least desire it.

If we were asked what policy we would have the Government, including our own in America, pursue in the face of the agitation and unrest of the people who are impatient over the wrongs they suffer and want better things, we would answer the question by quoting the famous words of Count de Turgotville in the French Chamber of Deputies, in the year 1841. Reviewing the agitation of the times he gave it as his profound conviction that "we are clambering over a volcano", and denouncing the tyranny practiced by the French administration he exclaimed, "and the heathen cry of his audience, 'Change the spirit of the government; for God's sake, change the spirit of the government; for the present spirit is leading us to destruction'."

That de Turgotville was right is shown by the fact that his speech was delivered on the eve of the great revo-

tones of truth which converted King Louis Philippe and dethroned his oppressor. Nothing could have needed the dangerous situation which then existed but a change in spirit of the government. There is every reason to believe that that would have done so.

We must set reform agitators, and then drive them underground and make them meet dangerously exposed than ever. We must do what Lord Borne recommended centuries ago, in his essay on "Solomon and Trouble." "Concerning the material of wisdom," he says, "It is well to be considered that the surest way to prevent wisdom is to take away the matter of them (the cause). If they be not prepared it is hard to tell where the spark shall come that shall set it on fire."

In this passage Lord Borne is referring to the law of causation—a law as true as gravity or as physical—that where there is a phenomenon there

is a cause for that phenomenon, and that if the phenomenon is to be removed the cause must also be removed. If there is social or industrial or political unrest anywhere in the world to-day there is cause for it, and these causes must be removed. There is no other possible cure.

The whole truth is summed up by Ralph Waldo Emerson in his essay on "Politics." "We foolish people will rely on force, not yet learning that force can only bring us back, as here things have."

Great Britain in India, Great Britain in Ireland, not even United States of America, and every other nation in the world—in this time when unrest and desire for better conditions for humanity are stirring mankind to never before—will certainly do well to read the past and sobering words of President Wilson. "Repression is the seed of revolution"—usually of violent revolution.

A Nationalist Manifesto

The India Reform Act, the new "Government of India Act" which was passed by the British Parliament last December, is to go into effect at the beginning of 1919. This means that India will officially come into the era of party politics. For, by the provisions of the act, representatives will have to be elected by the enfranchised five million Indians to the Imperial and Provincial Legislative Councils. Rules for the representation of these Councils are already being formulated. The election of members to these Councils will take place in November next.

Although the majority of the delegates to the Indian National Congress last December expressed their opinion of the Act as being "unsatisfactory, disappointing and inadequate," the leaders of the Congress have decided to make the most of the Act, making it "the all in a word," and co-operating with the government in carrying out effect all its good features. They declare, however, that there will be "continuous opposition to the government in regard to all features which the Indian people deem unjust and detrimental to the interests of their nation." Their general

policy will be to "educate, agitate, and organize" the electorate.

Now that the elections are so near and since so much depends on the character of the new Imperial and Provincial Councils, the leaders are setting themselves to the task of educating the public to an understanding of the issues at stake, and securing the election of men to the Councils who will carry out the ideas and policies expressed. It seems that the future policy of the Indian people as a whole will be shaped to some degree by the manifesto which was being read just now by President Congress Organization and by individual leaders of influence.

One of the most important of these manifestos has been issued by Mr. B. G. Tilak. It comes in time, as do also the manifestos of the Madras Nationalist Party, and other statements of principles, to focus the attention of the country upon a number of matters of importance. Even if the Tilak manifesto is not adopted as its entirety as a national platform (as it is not likely to be) it will be certain to have much influence in shaping the general national policy of the Indian people. The manifesto declares, in its introduction:

"The Congress Democratic Party is a party animated by feelings of sincere and loyal love to the Congress, and faith in Democracy. It believes in the power of democratic institutions for the solution of Indian problems, and regards the extension of education and political franchise as two of its best weapons. It advocates the removal of all caste barrier or social disabilities based on caste or religion. It believes in religious toleration.

It regards the Manu

Reform Act as "undemocratic, unsatisfactory and disappointing" and will strive to remedy the defect by introducing with the aid of the members of the Indian party and other sympathizers in the British Parliament, at the earliest opportunity a New Reform Bill for establishing full responsible government in India, including full military control and full fiscal freedom and an educational declaration of rights with constitutional guarantees. To achieve this object, it contemplates and recommends a united and energetic campaign in India and in the countries represented on the League of Nations. In this matter the party's watch word will be "Education, and Agitate and Organize."

This party proposes to track the Manu Reform Act for all it is worth and for accelerating the grant of full responsible government, and for this purpose it will without limitation offer co-operation as much to constitutional opposition, whenever may be expedient and best calculated to give effect to the popular will."

Among the numerous points which it makes the following may be mentioned as illustrative of the pressing needs which are demanding the consideration of the people:

Repeal of all oppressive legislation (e. g., Rowlatt Act, the Press Act, the Arms Act, etc.) and repeal by a party of our's own constitution.

Granting law the laboring classes agricultural and industrial, a fair share of the fruits of labor, a fair minimum wage reasonable hours of work and decent house accommodations.

Control of the export of foodstuffs.

and other necessities of life by itself as by other methods with a view of reducing the price thereof and conserving supplies.

Promotion of Sanitation and development of Indian Industries by all recognized methods.

Nationalization of railways and regulation of railway tariffs by legislation. Bureaucratic, in every department, especially in military expenditure, must be graduated according to the capacity of various classes, corporations or individuals, so that the burden may be proportionate to the means or wealth of the taxpayer.

Commission for Indians in all military services without racial distinction too.

Retrenchment of all services by open competitive examination in India.

Promotion of national unity by such means as the establishment of a League League for all India, and Hindu-Muslim Extremist.

Immediately securing full popular suffrage for the provinces. Education through the vernacular as high as possible.

Free and compulsory education without distinction of sex.

Restoration of Village Panchajayats with administrative and judicial powers.

Abolition of drink.

Extension of the franchise without any restriction.

Sanitation upon a systematic basis under a committee of health.

Carrying out of reforms already commenced, e.g., Agricultural development, extension of railways, the co-operative movement, industrial and technical education suitable to the needs of the country—organized medical relief and no encouragement to indigenous systems of medicine.

Upon this program the National Congress Democratic Party of India speaks for voice and aid for the support of candidates pledged to these principles.

The Y. W. C. A. and India

By J. T. SOUTHWELL

It is deeply to be regretted that a great Christian organization like the Y. W. C. A. should array itself on the side of the foreign power whose armed hosts India is subjected to, and against the Indian people in their struggle for freedom. In a recent issue of the *New Thought News*, of New York, (published by the National Board of the Y. W. C. A.) the leading article is entitled "A Million Have Answered India's Need." In this article the editor contemptuously dismisses as "un-

scrutinized" the great and earnest effort that is being made by practically the entire Indian nation, through peaceful and wholly constitutional methods, to obtain self-government, and sides with the foreign rulers who refuse to grant to the great nation of three hundred and thirty millions of people under their rule, even the right to select or to alter a single one of the laws by which they are governed, or to initiate a single reform of their national revenue, all of which comes from the

pockets of the Indian peasant and the Indian worker.

The article declares that India is held back from taking its place as a first-class power in the world, not by the ruling English Government, but by an even more inhuman system among its women, which confines them closely to the home, and by its religious caste system "which prohibits anybody from rising in the world." "The Brahmins," we are told, "are by that system at the top, and it is they who want home rule for India, for that means Brahmin rule."

Now, we are far from defenders of the patriarch system or the caste system, both are evils unpersonally, which many of the best people of India themselves are earnestly endeavoring to get rid of. But it should be borne in mind that caste exists in all countries. They exist only in parts of India and among portions of the population, and when they do exist they breed evils, and these evils become as more and more being eliminated. To say that these systems in India for self-government is to condemn the aspirations of all the people for freedom, and to maintain a strange ignorance of India, is also done prejudicially.

As to the women of India, the truth is there is a very strong movement, extending to all parts of the land, in favor of women's advancement, education of women and girls, and genuine freedom for women, and the most influential and powerful organizations in the entire nation, namely, the Indian National Congress, has declared for Women Suffrage.

As to caste, it applies neither to political matters nor to business. All castes do business with one another and all mingle freely in political affairs. It is simply ridiculous, therefore, to declare that the existence of caste in India for self-government and provides a two-caste power in holding her in bondage. Nothing could be more false than the statement that "the caste system precludes anybody from rising in the world," that "self-rule in India means Brahmin rule," and that it is the Brahmins alone "who want home-rule." The truth is, many of the most distinguished men of India in the past and in the present have not been and are not Brahmins. Many men of the lowest caste and even of no caste at all due to positions of prominence. It is not a fact that the movement for home-rule is in any true sense a Brahmin movement. Only a minority of its leaders are Brahmins, and as its supporters, only a very small minority are Brahmins. It includes absolutely all castes from high to low, and absolutely all religions, Hindu, Mohammedan, Buddhist, Parsi, Sikh and Christian.

It would be less expeditious to see the Y. W. C. A. taking sides with the British government, and against the Indian people in their struggle for freedom, if the British government were to well doing anything to move us in any part even in the patriarch system. But it is not. On the contrary, again and again in the past it has directly encouraged and supported caste as a means of blocking reform and of strengthening its own grip upon India.

We gladly recognize that the Y. W. C. A. is an institution that has done

much good in America, and a doing some good among the Indian people. All the more regrettable it is, therefore, to see it using its influence against them in these matters and wholly just effort to gain greater liberty. It reminds one

of that unfortunate episode in the history of American Christianity before the Civil War, when many Christian churches supported slavery as a divine institution, and opposed the slaves to their just desire for freedom.

Law and Order in India

Native peoples
Can never govern themselves
In the way we (British) can
They do not understand
"Law-and-order."
And will not develop
Their natural resources
It is wrong to have
Natural resources.
And not to develop them,
It always ends
In the breakdown
Of Native governments,
And then
The British have to step in
To restore
"Law-and-Order."
We are a ruling race
Wherever the British flag flies
You will find
Law and order
—In India and Ireland
And in Egypt
Look at America!
If the Huns at Balkhinda
Had ruled India
Law and order
Would have broken down
And Native
Would have been tried
—In cold blood—
And executed
But we act differently

We are a ruling race
We just need for a General,
Who stops the whole thing
Without any bother
About trials.
He simply brought up
Some soldiers
And killed and wounded
Ten thousand natives,
Who were standing about
In the street
'This will help you to understand
What is meant
By the White Man's burden,
And why
We are a ruling race
The Indians are
A queer people
They have no sense of humor
And have been seen
To read "Punch"
Without smiling!
On the other hand,
They laugh
At things
Which do not appear funny
To us
This is known
As misanthropism,
And is why
Our General,
Our great General Dyer,
Had to restore

"Law and Order"

At Amritsar
For he knew (and he said)
That if he failed to shoot
These two thousand natives
They would have laughed at him
That would have been awful.
Is it very wicked to laugh
At a General?
A good General
Can usually
Kill some of the people
Who laugh at him

That preserves
"Law and Order"
We (British) are a ruling race
And therefore
We must always
Preserve "Law and Order" and
Preserve people
From laughing at us
Even we have to shoot
Two thousand of them,
At our great and good
General Dyer did
(From the London Daily Herald)

Book Reviews

Teaching the Hindoos

By Carl Ackerman
Macmillan Co., New York

Balkhinda Ratta

By EUGENE ARMAND
Alfred Knopf, New York

Caught by the Turb

By FRANKLIN YOUNG BROWN
Macmillan Co., New York

The two books on Rama form interesting reading for the disinterested reader of one which day is steadily illustrated. Both writers have viewed Rama, and have recorded their observation in accordance with their individual comic sense as in the notes of the experiment that is being tried out in one of the largest laboratories of the world.

The keynote of Mr. Ackerman's book is furnished by the publisher's note that the book is a study of "humanity running wild." The obvious conspicuous aspect in which the author approaches his subject dominates considerably the value of the book as a historical study of the actual conditions obtaining in Rama.

Mr. Ackerman's condemnation of the Balkhinda movement is summed up in his characterization of Rama as a kind of "Nihilism," meaning negative nihilism. It is regrettable that such an adversely worded note as Mr. Ackerman presents should be made to lose its full value because of the partisan, hostile presentation of the subject.

Mr. Armand, on the other hand, has endeavored, as he explains in his preface, to "tell without passion and with out dissimulation what the Balkhinda Rama I have seen as, what are its philosophy, its doctrine, its aims, and its deeds."

The author is not so much sympathetic with the Balkhinda movement, as is evidenced in many passages throughout the book. But one feels that he is understanding, as far as possible, to determine personal prejudices, and to present his material as he found it. The events immediately preceding the Balkhinda camp-fires are vividly outlined, the theoretical basis of the new order is presented, the leaders of the revolution are

traged—*in short, all phases of the situation are encompassed in the endeavor to give readers a thorough knowledge of the Russian upheaval and its causes.*

"We recommend Mr. Austereil's account as a valuable contribution to the fragmentary conception so current about Bolshevik Russia.

Captain Yeats Brown's book on the Turks is a pleasing story of adventure which the author experienced during his imprisonment, for three years, in Turkish territory. His association with the "unspeakable, murderous Turks" has convinced him, he admits, that the Turks are not as terrible as they are credited with being.

While the book is not devoted essentially to the vindication of the character of the Turkish people, Captain Yeats Brown has cited many striking instances of his meeting with *good* Turks. In one chapter he says:

"The first liar Turk has many good qualities, of which generosity and gallantry are not the least. Something in Anglo-Saxon blood is in sympathy with the adventure-loving, flower-loving Turk. But, alas, there is another type of Ottoman, with the tint of Tamerlane. 'When he is good he is very, very good, but when he is bad he is horrid.'"

Speaking, elsewhere, of his meeting with a young Turk in the desert, he says:

"Here in the desert we met as brothers. A finer figure of a man I have rarely seen, nor a truer gentleman. He was an ardent young Turk, and if other young Turks were cast in such a mold, there would be a place in the world for the Ottoman race."

The book is one of adventure and affords entrancing reading, with its thrills and plots.

"There is no trace in this book of anything except disinterested idealism and a horror of the evil portrayed."—*Francis Hackbert.*

THE OPIUM MONOPOL

By ELLEN N. LA MOTTE

Author of "Backwash of War," "Peking Dust," "Credulism," etc.

Regular Price \$4.00

SPECIAL OFFER

One Year's subscription to YOUNG INDIA (regular price \$1.50) and a copy of La Motte's OPIUM MONOPOLY (regular price \$4.00)

for \$2.00

Young India

1400 Broadway

New York City

Lantern Slides

YOUNG INDIA offers for sale the following set of seven lantern slides:

1. View of the Jalfarwulla Park.
2. and 3. Views of the beauty-shall-ed walls of the Park.
4. View of the "Crawling Order" being enforced.
5. "Who would be free"—cartoon.
6. "Help India Free Herself"—cartoon.
7. Photograph of General Dyer.

Organizers, students, lecture bureaus, speakers, etc., will find this set most useful in their work.

Price per set... \$6.00

Young India

1400 Broadway

New York City